

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/568,669	11/08/2006	David B. Agus	67789-542	9540	
50670 DAVIS WRIC	7590 11/12/200 HT TREMAINE LLP/I	EXAM	EXAMINER		
865 FIGUEROA STREET RAWLINGS, STEPHEN			STEPHEN L		
SUITE 2400 LOS ANGELI	ES, CA 90017-2566	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
DOD I I COLL	.5, 0.175517 2555	1643			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/12/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentlax@dwt.com sethlevy@dwt.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/568,669	AGUS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Stephen L. Rawlings	1643		

		Stephen L. Rawlings	1643							
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address									
THE	REPLY FILED 03 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.							
1. 🛚	☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:									
a)	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing									
b)	∑The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FIRAL REJECTION. See MPEP 766.07(f).									
have under set fo may r	Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension plant by the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension plant by the desired provided from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late than the emonths after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, MOTICE OF APPEAL									
	CIT The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).									
AME	NDMENTS									
3. 🛚	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause						
	 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 		ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for						
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.							
	NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1									
4. - 5. -	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).						
6.			timely filed amendmen	nt canceling the						
7. 🛚	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) \(\times\) will not be entered, or b) \(\times\) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) ejected: 10-19 and 29-33.									
ΔFFI	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: DAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE									
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).									
	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).						
	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation UEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.						
	The request for reconsideration has been considered bu The request for reconsideration is predicated upon entry been entered the request and the merit of Applicant's are Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	of the proposed amendment; howe	ever because the ame							
	Note the attached information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (Other:	1 10/05/06) Fapel NO(5)								
		(Otenhen I Devilings)								

/Stephen L. Rawlings/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1643

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment cannot be entered because if it were further consideration and search would be required in order to set forth new grounds of rejection of claims 31-37 under 3 SL.S.C. § 103(a). This is because the defaint ounder 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 by Anjali Jain, which was filed November 3, 2009, is considered sufficient to obviate the ground of rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Hedvat et at., but is insufficient to obviate further rejection of the claims under § 103(a) over the prior art, and entry of the amendment would appear to obviate all issues but issues related to the obviousness the invention in light of the teachings of the prior art. The need to raise such new grounds of rejection after a final Office action due to the provision of the declaration and entry of the proposed amendment is reason enough to derive netty of the amendment.